



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/848,743	05/03/2001	Jon Weil	476-2001	8046

23644 7590 05/18/2005

BARNES & THORNBURG  
P.O. BOX 2786  
CHICAGO, IL 60690-2786

EXAMINER
----------

SALAD, ABDULLAHI ELMI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/848,743

Applicant(s)

WEIL ET AL.

Examiner

Salad E. Abdullahi

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6-18-04
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Response**

1. The Amendment filed on 2/28/2005 has been received and made of record.
2. Applicant's argument with respect to claims 1-28 are persuasive but are moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. For example claims, 1, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 21 recite the word "**fewer**", it is not clear what word fewer encompasses (is it one or two or more).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

Art Unit: 2157

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1-6, and 8-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jardetzky et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,392,989[hereinafter Jardetzky] in view of Anderson et al., U. S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0004843[hereinafter Anderson].

As per claims 1, 17 and 21 Jardetzky discloses a method of fault recovery in a multi-layer communications network having a transport layer topology and an overlay topology, in which adjacencies are defined between a plurality of network nodes, the method comprising, for each adjacency for which a recovery path is to be determined, modifying the overlay topology by removal of selected adjacencies attempting computation of a path (see col. 2, lines 54-65, col. 4, lines 36-67 and col. 9, lines 26-35).

Jardetsky is silent regarding: and if no path is available removing fewer selected adjacencies from the overlay topology and repeating said path computation.

Anderson discloses a fault recovery mechanism including calculating recovery path and if no path is available removing fewer (i.e., selected one) of adjacencies from the overlay topology and repeating said path computation (see paragraph 0048 and 0078).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Anderson to the system of Jardetsky, thus enabling to quickly find a recovery path.

Art Unit: 2157

As per claim 2, Anderson discloses the method as claimed in claim 1, wherein said adjacencies are selected from a knowledge of the transport layer topology (see paragraph 0078).

As per claim 3, Jardetzky discloses a method of calculating a protection path for traffic carried on a main path in a multilayer communications network having a lower transport layer and an upper layer incorporating a plurality of routers, and in which adjacencies are defined between respective pairs of routers, the method comprising the steps of; defining a model of the network (see fig. 3b and col. 6, lines 13-27); defining in said model a hierarchy of protection levels, each said protection level being characterized by a respective set of broken adjacencies in said model (see col. 5, lines 6-52); attempting to calculate a recovery path for a selected protection level in said hierarchy (see figs. 3A and 3B and col. 5, lines 6-52).

Jardetsky is silent regarding: if no said path is available, repeating said calculation attempt for successive further protection levels in said hierarchy until a protection path is identified.

Anderson discloses a fault recovery mechanism including calculating recovery path and if no said path is available, repeating said calculation attempt for successive further protection levels in said hierarchy until a protection path is identified (see paragraph 0048 and 0078). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2157

the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Anderson to the system of Jardetsky, thus enabling to quickly find a recovery path.

As per claim 4, Jardetzky discloses a method of calculating a protection path for traffic carried on a main path in a multi-layer communications network comprising a lower transport layer and an upper overlay incorporating a plurality of routers, there being a plurality of adjacencies defined between respective pairs of routers, wherein the method comprises the steps of:

defining a software model of the overlay of said network (see col. 6, lines 13-27);  
defining in said model a hierarchy of protection levels for said main path, each said protection level being characterized by a respective set of one or more broken adjacencies in said model (see col. 6, lines 13-27);  
selecting one said protection level and calculating a protection path avoiding the broken adjacencies associated with that protection level (see col. 5, lines 6-52);  
determining whether the calculated protection path is available in the network(see col. 5, lines 6-52).

Jardetsky is silent regarding: if said calculated path is not available in the network, repeating said path calculation and determining steps for one or more further selected protection levels

Anderson discloses a fault recovery mechanism including calculating recovery path and if said calculated path is not available in the network, repeating said path calculation and determining steps for one or more further selected protection levels (see paragraph

Art Unit: 2157

0048 and 0078). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Anderson to the system of Jardetsky, thus enabling to quickly find a recovery path.

As per claim 5, Anderson discloses a method as claimed in claim 4, wherein said protection levels are selected in order of hierarchy (i.e., priority)(see paragraph 0043).

As per claim 6, Anderson discloses a method as claimed in claim 5, wherein said protection path is calculated via a next hop algorithm (see paragraph 0064).

As per claim 7, Anderson discloses the method as claimed in claim 6, wherein a protection level is selected according to a class of traffic carried on the path to be protected (see paragraph 0104).

As per claim 8, Anderson discloses the method as claimed in claim 7, wherein said network incorporates a transport layer comprising a plurality of switches interconnected by optical fiber paths (see paragraph 0049).

As per claim 9, Anderson discloses the method as claimed in claim 7, wherein the network model topology is defined by a first list of adjacencies representing the overlay topology, and a second list of paths, one for each adjacency (see paragraph 0113).

Art Unit: 2157

As per claim 10, Anderson discloses the method as claimed in claim 9, and further comprising editing the network model topology by selecting sequentially the adjacencies in the overlay topology, testing each adjacency against assumptions about what equipment has failed in light of a hypothesized IP layer adjacency loss indication, and, if the adjacency passes the test, removing it from the topology (see paragraph 0048 and 0078).

As per claim 11-12, Anderson discloses the method as claimed in claim 10, wherein said transport layer comprises a synchronous network (see paragraph 0039)

As per claim 13-14, Anderson discloses the method as claimed in claim 12, wherein said network is a multi-protocol label switched network (see paragraph 0040).

As per claims 15, 16, 8 and 19, the claims include features similar to those of claim 1, further reciting assuming a failure of plurality of network element (see Anderson paragraph 0087).

As per claim 20, Jardetzky discloses a network manager as claimed in claim 19, and embodied as software in machine-readable form on a storage medium (see col. 3, lines 57-58).



Art Unit: 2157

As per claim 22-23, Anderson discloses a network as claimed in claim 21, wherein said protection system defines in said model a hierarchy of protection Levels for said main path each said protection level being characterized by a respective set of one or more broken adjacencies in said model (see paragraph 0043)).

As per claim 24, Anderson discloses a network as claimed in claim 23, wherein said protection path is calculated via a next hop algorithm (see paragraph 0064).

As per claim 25, Anderson discloses Anderson discloses network as claimed in claim 24, and incorporating a transport Layer comprising a plurality of switches interconnected by optical fiber paths (see paragraph 0049).

As per claim 26-27, Anderson discloses layer comprises a synchronous network (see paragraph 0039)

As per claim 28, Anderson discloses a network as claimed in claim 27, and comprising a multi-protocol label switched network (see paragraph 0040).


## **Conclusion**

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2157

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Salad E Abdullahi whose telephone number is 571-272-4009. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Abdullahi Salad  
Examiner AU 2157  
5/15/2005